

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 7 and 13 are pending in this application, with Claim 1 being the sole independent claim. Claim 1 has been amended to include a feature previously recited in Claim 7. Claim 7 has been amended to further define features of one torsion spring. Support for the newly recited features of Claim 7 can be found, for example, in Figs. 2A and 5. Accordingly, no new matter has been added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-4 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,233,426 (Lee) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,172,660 (Yanofski). Claims 7 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee, Yanofski and U.S. Patent No. 5,541,712 (Fujitaka). These rejections are traversed.

Claim 1 now recites that *one torsion spring* is configured and positioned to eliminate the play between the hinge member and the cover member in a direction parallel to the rotary shaft, thereby making constant the axial positional relation between said hinge member and said cover member by biasing said cover member in a direction parallel to said rotary shaft, wherein said cover member is also biased in a direction in which said cover member is opened with respect to said hinge member. Fujitaka was relied upon for generally teaching a torsion spring. Column 10, lines 10-13 of Fujitaka discusses this feature, disclosing, “the torsion spring 40 generates an opening moment about the shaft 38.” Fujitaka does not, however, disclose a force in a direction *parallel* to the shaft 38. As shown Figure 7, a coil portion of the torsion spring 40 is disposed within a U-shaped cross-section portion of a bracket 39. A force generated by the torsion spring 40 in the direction parallel to the shaft 38 is held within bracket 39.

Therefore, any force generated by the torsion spring 40 in a direction parallel to the shaft 38 could not be exerted on a cover member 34.

Furthermore, Fujitaka discloses two torsion springs 40 symmetrically arranged in two hinge portions as shown in Figure 11. As discussed above, Fujitaka does not generate a force in the direction parallel to the shaft 38. Assuming, *arguendo*, that the torsion spring of Fujitaka could generate a force in a direction parallel to the shaft 38, the forces of the two torsion springs 40 exerted on a holder member 36 would cancel each other out. Therefore, the two torsion springs of Fujitaka cannot generate a force to be exerted on the cover member in a direction parallel to the shaft and cannot bias the cover member in a direction parallel to the shaft as generally recited in independent Claim 1.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the cited patents, taken individually or in combination, cannot render obvious the invention as presently claimed in independent Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ann M. McCamey/

Ann M. McCamey
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 57,016

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

AMM:eyw

FCHS_WS 1714392v1